

App. No.: 10/658,958  
Docket No.: CFA00006US

**Amendment(s) to the Drawing(s):**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figures 12 and 13. The attached sheets which include Figures 12 and 13 replace the original sheets including Figures 12 and 13. In Figures 12 and 13 the label "Prior Art" has been added. No new matter has been added.

App. No.: 10/658,958  
Docket No.: CFA00006US

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application, claims 1, 9, and 16 being independent. Claims 2, 6-7, and 9-18 have been amended for clarity and grammatical reasons, and Figures 12 and 13 have been amended.

### **Drawing Objection**

The Examiner has indicated (Office Action, pg. 2), that the drawings are objected to for not containing a "Prior Art" label. Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to amended Figures 12 and 13, where the label "Prior Art" has been added. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of the Drawings.

### **Prior Art Rejections**

#### **1. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) based on Furuhashi et al. in view of Shirasaki et al.**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,771, herein referred to as Furuhashi) in view of Shirasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,943,753, herein referred to as Shirasaki). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that Furuhashi shows, suggests, or teaches an "acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with image display device" (Office Action, pg. 4), then states that Furuhashi fails to teach an "acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location" (Office Action, pg. 4) and states that Shirasaki allegedly shows such a feature and cites Shirasaki column 6, lines 27-40 as support.

App. No.: 10/658,958  
Docket No.: CFA00006US

Applicant recites portions of independent claims 1, 9, and 16 as follows, claim 1 partially states:

1. An image display device having a display unit, comprising:  
...acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location;  
generation means for generating resolution information on the basis of the resolution information acquired by the acquisition means and a resolution of the display unit...(claim 1)

Amended claim 9 which states in part:

9. An image display method using an image display device having a display unit, the image display method comprising the steps of:...  
acquiring resolution information from the image display device disposed at the downstream location;  
generating resolution information on the basis of the resolution information acquired in the acquisition step and the resolution of the display unit;...(amended claim 9)

and amended claim 16 which states in part:

16. (currently amended) A display control apparatus for controlling an image display device having a display unit, comprising:...  
acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location;  
generation means for generating resolution information on the basis of the resolution information acquired by the acquisition means and the resolution of the display unit;...(amended claim 16)

Clearly the display device of claim 1, the image display method of claim 9, and the display control apparatus of claim 16, all are directed to a an image display device having a display unit. With regards to claim 1, the acquisition means is "for acquiring resolution information

App. No.: 10/658,958  
Docket No.: CFA00006US

associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location" (claim1).

Clearly the "image display device disposed at the downstream location" is a different image display device from "the image display device having a display unit" in claim1. Resolution information from the downstream image display device is acquired by the acquisition means in the current "image display device having a display unit." Likewise for amended claims 9 and 16.

As correctly stated by the Examiner, Furuhashi fails to show, suggest or teach "acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location." Furuhashi states in part:

The microprocessor 128 of the control unit receives a command included in control data transferred thereto through the control signal bus 132 and loads data stored in the data storing memory 130 into registers. ...Upon the reception of the command specifying partial display data, the microprocessor 128 of the control unit loads data into the registers so that the data output unit provides the partial display data...(Furuhashi, col. 7, ll. 1-9).

Clearly Furuhashi receives a command specifying the partial display data, and is silent with respect to "acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location" Likewise, Shirasaki is silent with respect to information obtained from a downstream location.

The portion of Shiraski cited by the Examiner is

Reference numeral 54 denotes nonvolatile EDID data memory means in which both EDID data of analog specification and EDID data of digital specification are stored. The DDC control means 55 performs DDC communication with the computer and when a DDC request signal is detected, the DDC control means 55 transmits a DDC transmission request detection signal to the discrimination means 53. Then, the DDC control means 55 is controlled to read the EDID data corresponding to the

App. No.: 10/658,958  
Docket No.: CFA00006US

specification of the video signal from the EDID data memory means 54 on the basis of the DDC switching control signal from the discrimination means 53 and transmits the read EDID data to the computer. (Shirasaki, col. 6, ll. 27-40)

As discussed in the specification "...an operating system...installed on a personal computer has the capability of automatically determining an optimum format ...from the computer to a display connected to the... computer. This capability is known as the plug and display capability. ...EDID ...is a specification for transmission of information associated with a display from the display to a host computer..." (specification pgs.3-4). The communication using EDID is between the display and the computer hosting the display. Shirasaki is directed to "a discriminator ..[that] judges whether a video signal inputted from the computer is ..analog specification or digital specification..[and] on the basis of the judgment ...the discriminator controls the DDC control.." (Shirasaki, abstract).

Shirasaki is not directed to multiple display units and clearly fails to show, suggest, or teach "acquiring resolution associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location."

To establish a *prima facie* case obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner has the burden of meeting the following three basic criteria: (1) the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the art or knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine teachings (M.P.E.P. § 2143)(emphasis added). Clearly from the discussion above the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of showing that Furuhashi, even in combination with Shirasaki (although Applicant does not admit either reference is combinable), shows,

App. No.: 10/658,958  
Docket No.: CFA00006US

suggests, or teaches all of the features of claim 1, and for the same reasons as above, amended claims 9 and 16.

Claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-18, depend either directly or indirectly on claims 1, 9, and 16, and for the same reasons as above, Furuhashi, even in combination with Shirasaki (although Applicant does not admit either reference is combinable), fails to show, suggest, or teach all of the features of claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-18.

Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

App. No.: 10/658,958  
Docket No.: CFA00006US

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the formal objections and rejections to the claims, and the rejections based on prior art. Because all claims are believed to define over prior art of record, Applicants respectfully request an early indication of allowability.


If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 468-2517 in the San Jose, CA area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2456 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Very truly yours,

Canon U.S.A. Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department

By

  
John P. Keedy, PhD, Esq.  
Reg. No. 56,389

7/10/2006

JPK/tt

15975 Alton Parkway  
Irvine, CA 92618-3731  
(408) 468-2517